

**International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers,  
Local 575, AFL-CIO (Coleman Electric Compa-  
ny) and Arvil Stevens. Case 9-CB-5579**

27 April 1984

**DECISION AND ORDER**

**BY MEMBERS ZIMMERMAN, HUNTER, AND  
DENNIS**

On 26 October 1983 Administrative Law Judge Frank H. Itkin issued the attached decision. The Respondent filed exceptions and a supporting brief.

The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

The Board has considered the decision and the record in light of the exceptions and brief and has decided to affirm the judge's rulings, findings,<sup>1</sup> and conclusions<sup>2</sup> and to adopt the recommended Order.

**ORDER**

The National Labor Relations Board adopts the recommended Order of the administrative law judge and orders that the Respondent, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 575, AFL-CIO, Portsmouth, Ohio, its officers, agents, and representatives, shall take the action set forth in the Order.

<sup>1</sup> The Respondent has excepted to some of the judge's credibility findings. The Board's established policy is not to overrule an administrative law judge's credibility resolutions unless the clear preponderance of all the relevant evidence convinces us that they are incorrect. *Standard Dry Wall Products*, 91 NLRB 544 (1950), enf'd. 188 F.2d 362 (3d Cir. 1951). We have carefully examined the record and find no basis for reversing the findings.

<sup>2</sup> In affirming the judge's conclusion that the Respondent violated Sec. 8(b)(1)(A) by requiring travelers to resubmit letters from their home locals as to their qualifications, we find it unnecessary to rely on the testimony of Caroline Harris.

**DECISION**

FRANK H. ITKIN, Administrative Law Judge. An unfair labor practice charge was filed in this case on May 17, and a complaint issued on July 1, 1983. A hearing was conducted in Portsmouth, Ohio, on August 18 and 19, 1983. The General Counsel alleges that Respondent Union violated Section 8(b)(1)(A) of the National Labor Relations Act by, in the operation of its hiring hall facility, requiring certain union members who are "travelers" from other locals to obtain from their respective home locals every 6 months letters demonstrating that they have passed a journeyman's test and have 4 years' experience in the industry, in order to sign Respondent Union's out-of-work referral list. The General Counsel further alleges that Respondent Union violated Section 8(b)(1)(A) of the Act by refusing to permit such union members to review the out-of-work list maintained

by Respondent Union for referrals. Respondent Union denies that it has violated the Act as alleged.

On the entire record, including my observation of the demeanor of the witnesses, and after due consideration of the briefs filed by counsel, I make the following

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

Respondent Union is admittedly a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act, as alleged. Coleman Electric Company is admittedly an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(2), (6), and (7) of the Act, as alleged. Coleman Electric and the Union, at all times pertinent here, have been parties to an agreement covering Coleman's employees, which agreement provides, inter alia, that the Union will be the sole and exclusive source of referral of applicants for employment. (See generally Jt. Exhs. 1 and 2.) See further, as stipulated at the hearing (Tr. 7-11),

the Union had a policy under its referral procedure which required applicants for referral [from sister locals] to submit documentation as to their qualifications when they were off the out-of-work list for a period of six months or more. . . . And, that documentation is the status of that applicant as a journeyman wireman, meaning that he had either passed a journeyman wireman's exam or gone through an approved apprenticeship training program conducted by a local union of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers . . . . Documentation would be generally in the form of a letter from the [applicant's] local union.

Arvil Stevens, the Charging Party here, is a member of a sister local of Respondent Union. Stevens testified that previously, during mid-1982, he had been referred by Respondent Union for work at Coleman Electric. His job at Coleman Electric terminated about January 21, 1983. Consequently, on or about January 27, 1983, he went to Respondent Union's hall "to sign up on their referral" or out-of-work list. Stevens recalled:

I [Stevens] went in and Greg Call was there at the window. I handed him my current dues paying card, the yellow slip, and I asked him about signing the book, and he [Call] stated, "Well . . . Arvil I'll have to have a letter from your local before . . . you can sign it," and I said, "Greg, I just got done working seven months for Coleman Electric, and you've got my vacation money and three percent assessment, and all . . . I don't know why I need any proof." Well, he said, "You'll have to get another letter from the local."<sup>1</sup>

Stevens "left" the hall. He promptly telephoned the business agent of his home local, Local 24, in Baltimore, Maryland, and again requested "another one of those let-

<sup>1</sup> It is undisputed that Stevens had furnished such documentation or proof to Respondent Union some seven or more months earlier, before being referred by the Union to Coleman Electric.

ters." His local business agent agreed to have such a letter "in the mail this afternoon."

Stevens, as he further testified, was required to sign Respondent Union's "out-of-work" list or "pad" "every 30 days" in order to "keep current." About March 2, 1983, Stevens showed up at the hall to "sign" this document or pad. He also discussed with Greg Call "where I am on the list" and whether he, Stevens, should be classified in "group one" or "group two." He again returned to the hall about March 28 or 29 to sign the list or pad. He testified, as follows:

Q. And then . . . what occurred?

A. . . . Greg had taken my card to go in the back . . . when he came back I signed his list, and I said, "Greg what group have you got me on? . . . Am I on book one or two?" He said, "Well you're number 298 or something like that." I said, "Well . . . I should be on group one . . . Now can I see that list?" And he said, "Well this is all I can tell you." . . . I said, "Well last year we went through this same thing and a Judge ruled that, on request, we were allowed to see the list. . . . Why can't I see it?" And he said, "Well, I don't know. I don't take care of that."

Stevens left.<sup>2</sup>

Stevens returned to the hall about the last week of April and "done the same thing." Again, he questioned Greg Call as to why he was not in "group one." Call told Stevens that "you're number 273,"

and he [Call] went . . . to the back . . . and he had come out with a yellow stationery pad . . . and he held it up and he said, "you're number 273. . . . I've got you here, Journeyman wireman," and out on the side, he had certified welder in pencil wrote with parentheses.

Stevens noted that Greg Call was then standing some 5 to 6 feet away when he "held" up the list, and "there were several pages turned back." Stevens further noted:

I asked him . . . to see . . . what book it was on, if I could see it, and that's all he did. He just held it up and said, "Well . . . you're number 273."

Greg Call "held it [the list] back at a distance" of some 5 feet.

Stevens returned to the hall during May and went through "the same routine." Again, he questioned his standing and classification on the list. Again, he said: "Well I'd like to see the book." Greg Call replied: "I can't help you there." Call, instead, "just told me a number." And, in June, Stevens while again asking Call about his standing and classification, asked: "You're sure I can't see that book?" Call responded: "That's all I can do . . . Just show you this . . . I'll just tell you where you're at." And, in July, Stevens again "asked him to see the book and what book I was on, and I still got the

same answer, that I'm [Call] sorry and that was about it." Stevens testified:

Q. . . . on each of the occasions you [Stevens] . . . went to the Union hall, you asked to see the books of Mr. Call?

A. Yes sir.

Q. Did Mr. Call ever permit you to see the books?

A. I wouldn't even know what the book looked like . . . the only thing I know was a yellow note-book pad.

Q. What was it that you signed?

A. . . . it was just a white paper . . . . It's laying . . . right on the counter. . . .

Stevens explained that he had asked to "see the books" because, in his view, "there were people going out to work . . . laid off after I was . . . . I had no way of knowing whether I was being treated fairly or not . . . ."<sup>3</sup>

Caroline Harris testified that she was employed by Respondent Union as a secretary from 1974 until May 1983. Harris recalled that Donald Keyser, business manager for the Union, had instructed her, in part as follows:

I wasn't to talk to the people at the window. I knew nothing about the referral procedure and I was to tell them that. And I was not to leave the book in the window if I had to walk away. . . . The referral book was attached to a clipboard with a rubber band around the bottom to secure the pages so people couldn't look through it.

Harris further recalled that Keyser had explained to her that the "reason" members of sister locals had to submit such qualification "letters,"

was to slow down some of the men going to work . . . to harass . . . travelers . . . . This was kind of a standing joke . . . it would just keep them out of work a little while longer . . . .

Keyser, on occasion, named to her those applicants or "travelers" who he "wanted to hassle or harass," including Arvil Stevens, because these applicants

had at some time or other crossed Don [Keyser], or a local man, or had harassed the Local in his opinion at some time or other.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> On cross-examination, Stevens was uncertain whether or not he was in fact permitted to sign the Union's out-of-work list or pad on or about January 27, 1983, even without a new letter from his home local. Stevens, after being shown a list or pad, recalled that he apparently did sign on January 27, 1983. Stevens insisted, however, that Call then stated to him: "Steven, I'll have to have a letter." In short, Stevens, although unclear "whether I signed or not" on January 27, was certain that he was required, under the Union's procedure, to obtain from his home local a new letter of his qualifications.

<sup>4</sup> On cross-examination, Harris acknowledged, inter alia, that her husband is an electrician who is a "traveler"; that her mother was also employed by Respondent Union; and that both she and her mother have been "laid off" by the Union. Harris denied, inter alia, any "bitter feelings" toward the Union because of the layoffs, however, she admitted being "confused" by the Union's conduct in this and related matters.

<sup>2</sup> Stevens, in his conversation with Call on or about March 28 or 29, was referring to an earlier unfair labor practice proceeding against Respondent Union which had been settled by the parties.

Donald Keyser, business manager of Respondent, generally explained the referral procedures utilized by his Union. Keyser noted, *inter alia*, that a "traveler" or member of a sister local seeking a referral "fills out an application and we have him sign the out-of-work list." Also, we "need a letter stating his qualifications," as stipulated *supra*. When the Union receives such a letter of qualification from the sister local, according to Keyser, "we have it attached to his application." There is also a "card system" which contains the pertinent data for each applicant. (see generally R. Exhs. 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, and 10.) Qualified applicants are then placed on the appropriate referrals list. They are moved up in priority as referrals take place. (See generally R. Exhs. 3, 9 and 11.)<sup>5</sup>

Keyser claimed that, "last year . . . after I found out that we had so many old records," he decided not to "keep them that long." About April or May 1982, applications older than 6, 7, or possibly 8 months were discarded. Prior to April or May 1982, such applications had been retained and, consequently, "travelers" was not required to apply every 6 months or so and thus obtain renewal letters of qualifications. Keyser claimed: "it was more or less for efficiency, more than anything," that is, discarding old applications, of travelers. Keyser claimed that the International, in its "Guide," indicates that such records should be retained for only 6 months. (Cf. R. Exh. 4.) And Keyser claimed that Charging Party Stevens in fact lost no referral because of any "delay" in submitting a new letter of qualification—this "delay" did not cause him "not to be referred to anty job."<sup>6</sup> Further, Keyser, denied, *inter alia*, various statements attributed to him by Caroline Harris. In addition, Keyser testified:

Q. Now with respect to the records that are kept by the Local Union, have you ever refused Mr. Stevens the right or opportunity to view the out-of-work list?

A. To my knowledge he never has been refused that opportunity.

Keyser generally denied having a "policy in effect that no traveler can see the out-of-work list." He asserted: "we don't have any policy on that."

Greg Call, assistant business manager and president of Respondent Union, testified, in part as follows:

Q. Now, on January 27th, 1983, do you recall your conversation with Mr. Stevens when he signed the out-of-work list?

A. No, not off-hand. I know that within—it wasn't last time, Mr. Stevens just signed the book and that was about it. And, two dates, and I couldn't tell you what dates they were, between January 27th and—well, I know it wasn't the last time, so it had to be between January 27th and June

20th, I know of at least twice where he has asked to see the book.

Q. Okay. Well, specifically on January the 27th, which was the first time he registered after being unemployed, did you inform him that it would be necessary for him to submit a letter of qualification from his Local Union?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Okay. And why was that?

A. Mr. Stevens had been working over six months, he wasn't actively on the referral book. In other words, he hadn't been signing the book, sometimes we get men that—maybe sign once, and we never see them again. So we—you know, he naturally drops off, and so there's no use keeping that record past six months. On the—on Mr. Stevens, he was not actively on the referral for six months. So, we required a new letter and application.

Q. Has there ever been an instance that—since you've maintained the records of the hiring hall, that someone was denied a referral because they had not submitted a letter.

A. No, huh-uh.

Q. Has there ever been an instance where someone would have been referred if they had a letter in?

A. No.

Q. Did Mr. Stevens suffer any loss of employment as a result of not having a letter on January 27th?

A. No, because the day he signed was the day he went on, so there isn't any time loss, you know, just when his turn come up—or, it come up.

Q. And now, do you recall if on April 25th, 1983, you had conversation with Mr. Stevens regarding the out-of-work list?

A. Well, I'm sure—you know, I told him, you know, where he was at and everything. Like I say, there was two days there I can't—I have so many men coming in and out it would be hard to tell what days it actually was. I've had two days where he was actually asked to see the out-of-work list, which would be this—you know—paper here. [Witness demonstrating.]

Q. You don't recall what actual days those were?

A. No, I don't.

Q. Okay. Was anyone present when Mr. Stevens asked to see the out-of-work list?

A. I think on one day, Greg Tingler.

Q. Do you recall anyone else being present on any day when Mr. Stevens asked to see the out-of-work list?

A. I think one other day Don was in the office there—present.

Q. Have you ever denied Mr. Stevens the right to see the out-of-work list?

A. No, I have not.

Q. On those two occasions when he requested to see the out-of-work list, what did you do?

<sup>5</sup> The distinction between "group one" and "group two" referrals and the separate lists maintained by the Union for these classifications is not alleged here to be discriminatory or otherwise unlawful. See Tr. 59-60, 75-76, 212.

<sup>6</sup> I note that the General Counsel here is not claiming any loss of work for Stevens as a result of this renewal requirement. See Tr. 212.

A. I went and got the list, and brought it out and held it up, just like I'm doing now [witness demonstrating], paged back to where his name was and, you know, just pointed my finger, you know, just to give the directions to where it was and if it—you know, if it was 273, well I just, you know, showed him there it was on 273.

Q. And did Mr. Stevens ever make any other request with respect to the list?

A. No, huh-uh. Just to see the list here, which I did twice.

Q. Did he say on those occasions that he wanted you to hand him the list, or anything like that?

A. No, huh-uh.

Q. Did he make any demand that he see any other records of the Local Union?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever denied Mr. Stevens or any other registrant at the Hiring Hall the right to see that list?

A. No, I have not.

Q. Have you ever been instructed not to give information to Mr. Stevens or any other non-members of Local 575?

A. No I have not.

Q. Have you ever been instructed, or is it a policy of the Local Union, not to show the out-of-work list to registrants at the Hiring Hall?

A. No, it is not.

Call, however, acknowledged that when Stevens came into the Union's hall on or about January 27 to sign the Union's out-of-work list, Call had Stevens' "card . . . in his file"; the card showed that Stevens was a "certified welder in group 2" who had been "sent out previously"; and, further, the card showed in effect that the Union "previously received from [Stevens] home local some documentation that he met the qualifications or requirement of group 2."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Virginia Keyser, wife of Business Manager Donald Keyser, periodically worked at the Union's hall. She denied, inter alia, that her husband ever instructed her not "to give out information to any travelers." She claimed that, "when they [members] wanted to look at the book there in the window, they could look at it any time they wanted to." She was referring apparently to the book which members signed when they were out of work. She also claimed that Harris "was jealous because I [Keyser] was there." She also claimed that she "never heard" Harris refuse to "give out any information about the referral procedure." Keyser was asked on cross-examination:

Q. Did the Local keep group lists?

A. I don't know. . . . I only took care of the window, and the men signed the book, and I stamped their cards.

Q. So, you never showed the men the group lists or anything like that?

A. I couldn't have. I didn't know there was one.

Richard Hill, recording secretary for the Union, claimed that about May 1982, Harris was "terminated." Keyser told Harris that "after a certain date . . . she'd no longer be needed." Harris assertedly warned Keyser that "there would be hard feelings." Hill also claimed that the reason given to Harris by Keyser for Harris' termination was "they were working against him more than for him." On cross-examination, Hill claimed, inter alia, "I can't remember exactly what happened there exactly."

Phillip Burton, a member of a sister local of Respondent, claimed that Greg Call repeatedly "told" him "where" he stood "on the out-of-work

I credit the testimony of Arvil Stevens, as detailed above. His testimony is substantiated in large part by undisputed documentary evidence and admissions by Respondent's witnesses and counsel. Stevens carefully and fully related his account of the pertinent sequence of events culminating in the filing of the instant charge. I am persuaded here, relying also on demeanor, that Stevens is a trustworthy and reliable witness. Likewise, I credit the testimony of Caroline Harris, as recited above. I have taken into account her "confusion" or alleged hostility resulting from her layoff and her mother's layoff as union employees. Nevertheless, I am persuaded here, on this full record, that Harris' testimony, as recited herein, is truthful. In short, her "confusion" or claimed hostility may be the reason she has readily and fully divulged the information quoted herein; nevertheless, her testimony, in this respect, is complete, candid, and trustworthy. On the other hand, I do not find Donald Keyser and Greg Call to be forthright and reliable witnesses. Their testimony was at times vague, incomplete, and evasive. Insofar as the testimony of Donald Keyser and Call conflicts with the above testimony of Stevens and Harris, I find, on this record, the testimony of the latter witnesses to be more complete and reliable.<sup>8</sup>

#### Discussion

It is settled law that a union "owes a duty of fair representation to employees in the bargaining unit"; this "duty extends to applicants for employment through [the union's] hiring hall"; and Section 8(b)(1)(A) of the Act "prohibits labor organizations, when acting in a statutory representative capacity, from taking action against any

list." Burton assertedly was never denied "the information of where [he] stood on the list." Burton assertedly was "shown" where "he stood on the list"; the list "was available . . . for inspection." However, Burton, on cross-examination, admittedly "never asked" to see the out-of-work list. He was never present "when anybody else has asked to see the list." Also see the testimony of members Frank Allen, Loren Grooms, and Lester Kayser.

Gregory Tingler, a member of the Union's executive board, claimed that about April or May 1983, Stevens "said [to Call] he wanted to sign the book . . . and then he wanted to see the book." Call "brought the book around and let him look at it." On cross-examination, Tingler admitted that "during this conversation" between Call and Stevens, he "could [not] see them"—the only thing [he had] observed was when Mr. Call came back around and got the list."

Randy Bailey, a member of the Union, also claimed that Harris once "told" him on the telephone "that she had been terminated from the Local" and "her mother" also had "been terminated." Harris sought his assistance. Bailey refused. Harris assertedly then warned that "she had enough to hang us all."

William Strang Jr., an executive board member of the Union, claimed that Harris also sought his assistance when her mother was terminated. He refused and she assertedly threatened: "Well, I'll get Don Keyser, I'll hang him."

Michael Reed, a business manager of a sister local, generally denied, inter alia, hearing Harris and/or Keyser discussing any limitation of certain referrals during the visit or visits to Respondent's hall.

<sup>8</sup> Much of the remaining testimony, noted and outlined supra, is essentially collateral or does not in any significant or material manner assist in resolving the narrow issues raised here. In any event, insofar as the testimony of Virginia Keyser, Richard Hill, Randy Bailey, William Strang, Mike Reed, Phillip Burton, Frank Allen, Loren Grooms, Lester Kayser, and Gregory Tingler, as noted supra, conflicts with that of Stevens or Harris, I find the testimony of Stevens and Harris to be more complete, forthright, and trustworthy. The testimony of the former witnesses is in large part incomplete, fragmentary, and vague.

employee upon considerations or classifications which are irrelevant, invidious or unfair." See generally *Iron Workers Local 433 (AGC of California)*, 228 NLRB 1420, 1438-39 (1977), and cases cited. The General Counsel does not contend here that Respondent Union's hiring hall procedures or classification system is unlawful; nor does he contend that employee Stevens, the Charging Party, was improperly classified or in fact discriminatorily treated in referrals. Instead, the General Counsel argues (Br. 10) that "the requirement that travelers . . . resubmit letters from their home locals 'as to their qualifications . . . if they have been off the out-of-work list more than six months, is arbitrary and discriminatory,'" in violation of Section 8(b)(1)(A) of the Act. I agree.

The credible and essentially undisputed evidence of record shows here that Respondent Union—in requiring travelers from sister locals to resubmit to Respondent letters restating their qualifications—was acting in an arbitrary, unreasonable, and discriminatory manner. This resubmission impediment or obstacle, placed in the path of the travelers who sought the use of Respondent Union's exclusive hiring hall facility, did not further any reasonable or legitimate objective of the Union. Indeed, as union representative Call acknowledge when he inspected the referral "card" of Charging Party Stevens during January 1983, it was apparent to him that Stevens previously had submitted such a letter of qualification and had been sent out to work. To require Stevens, and other travelers, to go through this motion again, under the circumstances present here, is unreasonable, discriminatory, and unfair. This requirement, not justified here, was plainly calculated to harass travelers from sister locals. As former union secretary Harris credibly explained, this resubmission requirement "was kind of a standing joke"—"it would just keep them out of work a little while longer."

Respondent Union, by requiring such resubmission, has violated Section 8(b)(1)(A) of the Act as alleged.

Further, it is also settled law that a union's "arbitrary refusal to comply" with an employee's "reasonable and manageable request for job referral information" affecting his employment also violates Section 8(b)(1)(A) of the Act. See generally *Operating Engineers Local 324 (AGC of Michigan)*, 226 NLRB 587 (1976). For, as the Board explained (*AGC of Michigan*, id. at 587),

. . . inherent in a union's duty of fair representation is an obligation to deal fairly with an employee's request for information as to his relative position on the out-of-work register . . . .

Charging Party Stevens, having previously charged Respondent Union with improper conduct in the operation of its hiring hall, and concerned that he may not be in the proper classification and was not being referred by number, reasonably and in good faith requested an opportunity to see the register or list. His repeated requests were denied. On one occasion, a union representative held up what purported to be the referral list to be inspected at a distance of some 5 or 6 feet. Under the circumstances present here, Respondent Union unjustifiably refused to permit Stevens to inspect the referral list of

register, as requested, in violation of Section 8(b)(1)(A) of the Act.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Respondent Union is a labor organization as alleged.
2. Coleman Electric is an employer engaged in commerce as alleged.
3. Respondent Union violated Section 8(b)(1)(A) of the Act by requiring travelers (members of sister locals) to resubmit letters from their home locals as to their qualifications demonstrating that they have passed a journeyman wireman's examination and have 4 years' experience in the trade, if they have been off the Union's out-of-work list more than 6 months, in order to be permitted to sign the Union's out-of-work list and, further, by refusing reasonable requests to permit such travelers to inspect and review the Union's out-of-work list and register.
4. The unfair labor practices found above affect commerce as alleged.

#### REMEDY

To remedy the unfair labor practices found above, Respondent Union will be directed to cease and desist from engaging in such conduct, or like or related conduct, and to post the attached notice.

On these findings of fact and conclusions of law and on the entire record, I issue the following recommended<sup>9</sup>

#### ORDER

The Respondent, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 575, AFL-CIO, Portsmouth, Ohio, its officers, agents, and representatives, shall

1. Cease and desist from
  - (a) Requiring travelers (members of sister locals) to resubmit letters from their home locals as to their qualifications, demonstrating that they have passed a journeyman wireman's examination and have 4 years' experience in the industry, if they have been off the Union's out-of-work list more than 6 months, in order to be permitted to sign the Union's out-of-work list.
  - (b) Refusing reasonable requests by such travelers to inspect and review the Union's out-of-work list and register.
  - (c) In any like or related manner interfere with, restraining or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.
2. Take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the purposes and policies of the Act.
  - (a) Post at its offices, facilities, hiring hall, and meeting places copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."<sup>10</sup> Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the

<sup>9</sup> If no exceptions are filed as provided by Sec. 102.46 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the findings, conclusions, and recommended Order shall, as provided in Sec. 102.48 of the Rules, be adopted by the Board and all objections to them shall be deemed waived for all purposes.

<sup>10</sup> If this Order is enforced by a Judgment of a United States Court of Appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall be deemed waived for all purposes.

Regional Director for Region 9, after being signed by the Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondent immediately upon receipt and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to members are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(b) Notify the Regional Director in writing within 20 days from the date of this Order what steps the Respondent has taken to comply.

---

tional Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

## APPENDIX

### NOTICE TO MEMBERS POSTED BY ORDER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD An Agency of the United States Government

WE WILL NOT, in the operation of our hiring hall facility, require travelers (members of sister locals) to resubmit letters from their home locals as to their qualifications, demonstrating that they have passed a journeyman wireman's examination and have 4 years' experience in the industry, if they have been off our out-of-work list more than 6 months, in order to permit such travelers to sign out out-of-work list.

WE WILL NOT refuse reasonable requests by such travelers to inspect and review our out-of-work list and register.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner restrain or coerce employees in the exercise of their rights under Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL 575, AFL-CIO